A9330-3

HUMAN SERVICES IN FY82:

SHRINKING RESOURCES IN TROUBLED TIMES

A Survey of Human Services Officials in the Nation's Cities

October, 1982

The United States Conference of City Human Services Officials

UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF MAYORS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	3
SURVEY APPROACH	7
THE EFFECT OF FEDERAL CUTS ON HUMAN SERVICE PROGRAMS	9
COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL CUTS	12
EMERGENCY SERVICES	13
BLOCK GRANT IMPLEMENTATION	15
IMPACT OF PROBLEMS ON PEOPLE IN CITIES	17
APPENDIX: THE 55 CITIES RESPONDING TO THE SURVEY	

SUMMARY

To assess the status of human services in cities at the start of the new fiscal year, the U.S. Conference of City Human Services Officials surveyed its members to determine: 1) the program areas in cities most affected by FY82 cuts, the percentage of funds cut from these programs, and the percentage of the eligible population going unserved; 2) the impact of current economic conditions and record high unemployment on the demand for emergency services; and 3) the impact of state block grants on human services in cities. Fifty-five cities (over 60 percent of all those contacted) responded with information on the status of human services in their community.

- Health, employment and training, and senior service programs were identified as the program areas most severely affected by federal budget cuts in FY82.

- In not one of the human service areas examined was even 50 percent of the eligible population served in FY81 or FY82. Employment and training and social service programs reached the smallest portion of the eligible population - 6 percent and 7.4 percent respectively in FY82.

- Reductions in funds available for programs ranged from a 56 percent cut in employment and training programs and a 42 percent cut in health programs down to a 5 percent cut in senior services.

- Fifty-four percent of the cities reporting were using local general revenues to compensate for federal cuts; 60 percent reported an increase in private sector contributions. Only 12 percent were able to tap other federal sources to try to make up for cuts.

- Seventy-eight percent of the cities identified shelter and 73 percent identified food as the emergency services most in demand in cities. Also in demand were fuel assistance, income assistance and medical care.

- Across all cities submitting information, officials reported that an average of 43 percent of the overall demand for emergency services was met in FY82.

- Two-thirds of the cities reported that the conversion to state block grants in FY82 had adversely affected their local human services programs. Seventy percent of the cities did not feel they had been fairly represented in either the state planning or the state resource allocation processes under the block grants. And three out of four cities did not feel that human services funds had been passed through the state to their local programs in an adequate manner.

- Human services officials characterized the combined effects of the economic downturn, high unemployment and federal program cuts through a number of observations.

  - The emergence of the "new poor" - the people who are losing their jobs, exhausting their financial resources, exhausting their unemployment benefits and losing their homes.

  - The problems of the "working poor" - the people who are losing their public or private jobs and job-related benefits and being forced back on welfare.

  - The breakup of families because of economic problems and the lack of the housing and other support needed to keep them together.

  - The special problems created by the unemployed transient workers who have been drawn to the cities of the West and Southwest in search of jobs.

INTRODUCTION

This report describes the efforts of city officials across the country to meet the pressing needs for human services during the economic decline that occurred in the nation throughout Fiscal Year 1982. The report is based on data supplied by human services officials in 55 cities across the country in October 1982.

Human services are defined as services which provide assistance directly to people. Human services may be preventive or corrective and aim to promote self-sufficiency among those served. While the exact nature of services may vary from one city to another, most cities include in their definition social services, child day care, income assistance, information and referral, employment and training, and services to specific populations such as children, youth, families, elderly and disabled persons.

In each fiscal year since FY80 cities have had to adjust to reductions in federal aid. These federal budget cuts have been severe and have affected the urban infrastructure -- the maintenance of deteriorating streets and bridges, sewer and water systems, sidewalks and buildings -- as well as the programs of direct aid to people in need. Cities have reduced police, fire and sanitation services and have deferred purchases of public transit equipment.

Background

In the summer of 1981, a reconciliation bill governing the funding of federal programs for FY82 was overwhelmingly adopted by both Houses of Congress. In this bill, about 200 domestic spending programs were cut or eliminated. A U.S. Conference of Mayors survey of 100 cities conducted in early FY82 indicated that in response to federal cuts, 60 percent of the cities were laying off workers, that over 40 percent had raised or were planning to raise taxes, and that most were cutting services and deferring capital spending.

Human services programs were especially hard hit in the budget cutting for FY82. In the health area, programs were cut by 30 percent and combined in block grants. Health block grants included the following:

- Maternal and child health - consolidated several programs; authorized $373 million for FY82;
- Preventive health and health services - consolidated eight programs; authorized $95 million for FY82;
- Alcohol, drug abuse, and mental health - consolidated three programs; authorized $491 million for FY82; and
- Primary care - included only community health centers; authorized $280 million for FY82.

Remaining as separate categorical programs were: family planning ($130 million); veneral disease control ($40 million); immunization ($29.5 million); tuberculosis control ($9 million); migrant worker health ($43 million); adolescent pregnancy ($30 million); special research ($3 million); and black lung ($5 million).

Separate block grants were established for energy assistance at $1.88 billion (the FY81 level) and for community action at $354 million (a 30 percent cut). The social services block grant was authorized at a level of $2.4 billion (an 18 percent cut). Separate programs included in the reconciliation bill were child abuse prevention ($19 million), developmental disabilities ($61 million), and vocational rehabilitation ($1 billion). Not included in the bill and remaining at their current authorization levels were foster care and adoption assistance, child welfare services and runaway youth.

While a "cap" was not imposed on federal payments to the states for medicaid, as had been proposed by the Administration, those payments were reduced by approximately $1 billion a year for the following three years: 3 percent in FY82, 4 percent in FY83, and 4.5 percent in FY84.

Existing public health service hospitals were to be closed by the end of FY82, or sooner. Those transferred to local control were to remain open through FY82; others were to be closed at the end of FY81.

Cuts of $1.7 billion were authorized for the $12 billion food stamp program, $200 million more than the Administration requested. The cuts were to take about 1 million recipients off the rolls and reduce the benefits of another million. Approximately 22 million Americans were receiving benefits. Among the changes in the program were: restricting eligibility to families earning 130 percent of the poverty level and disallowing eligibility for striking workers who would otherwise qualify.

Cuts of $1.5 billion were made in child nutrition programs funded in FY81 at $4.4 billion. Cuts included school lunch subsidies, special milk, school breakfast, the child care food programs and the women,infants and children program. There was concern that school lunch programs in some financially strapped school districts would end. Subsidies for full-price lunches were to be provided only for children of families earning 130 percent of the poverty level. The price of reduced-price lunches was expected to double.

Cuts of $1 billion were made in the aid to families with dependent children by reducing benefits and tightening eligibility. States were allowed to adopt "workfare" programs, which requires recipients to take jobs in exchange for benefits. The Administration had proposed a mandatory "workfare" program. Striking workers who otherwise qualified were to be denied benefits.

The reconciliation bill put deep cuts in education programs and dramatically restructured many of the programs. About 30 programs of federal aid were consolidated in an elementary and secondary education block grant to states. Large programs of aid to education, such as the Title I program for disadvantaged students, was reduced, but not included in the block grants.

All public service jobs under the CETA program were eliminated for FY82. By the start of the fiscal year, cities had laid off all of their 300,000 public

workers nationwide. Many cities were paying unemployment compensation to these workers; some cities were paying welfare costs. At a time of rising unemployment in cities across the country, former CETA workers were experiencing little success in the job market.

Current Assessment

In cities across the country, human services officials operated programs during FY82 within the constraints of drastically reduced federal budgets, limited state and local revenues, and worsening economic conditions which contributed to client loads. The same operating conditions are expected in FY83. In addition, further cuts totaling $16.9 billion for FY83-85 have been enacted in major entitlement programs including food stamps, medicare, medicaid, and welfare. Most of the other human services programs, including the block grants, are to remain at current levels.

The U.S. Conference of City Human Services Officials, representing over 90 cities across the country, recognized a need at the end of FY82 to assess the situation and to make the results of the assessment available to those in the Administration and Congress who will be preparing the federal budget for FY84. The human services leaders are aware that additional domestic budget cuts have already been discussed within the Administration by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget. They are aware that political pressures to reduce the projected federal budget deficit will translate into calls by many in Congress to raise taxes and further reduce spending.

Human services administrators in cities across the country enter FY83 with the knowledge that 11 million Americans are unemployed and that another million and a half people have given up their search for a job. Administrators know that economic recovery is not expected to occur in the near term and that the current record high unemployment is likely to continue for many months. And they know that as the benefits run out for more and more unemployed workers concentrated in cities, the demands placed on human service programs by the unemployed workers and their families will stretch those programs far beyond their capacities. Human services officials enter FY83 with the belief that the gap between the service needs of city residents and the service capabilities of local programs will surely widen, that the growing numbers of unemployed and poor people living in America's cities will have fewer services available to them, fewer opportunities for relief from the human misery that accompanies joblessness and poverty.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors and other national organizations representing the governors, the state legislatures and the county governments have called upon the President to halt further domestic budget cuts. The assessment of human services programs in FY82 in this report supports that call. Members of the Conference of City Human Services Officials do not believe that the President and the Congress can permit the experiences of FY82 to continue throughout the current year into FY84.

SURVEY APPROACH

On September 24, 1982, letters requesting information on the status of human services in cities were sent to officials in 90 cities -- all members of the U.S. Conference of City Human Services Officials (USCCHSO). The letter indicated that USCCHSO staff would contact the human services officials to obtain their responses to the information request. At close of business on October 4, information had been gathered from 55 cities located in 25 states.

The letter requested information in six categories:

1. What are the three human service program areas (e.g., child day care, senior services, counseling, para-transit, energy assistance, weatherization) in your city that have been most affected by federal budget cuts in FY82?

2. For each program area, please indicate -

   - how many people are eligible for the service in your city;
   - how many people received this service during FY81;
   - how many people received this service during FY82;
   - how many people expected to receive it during FY83;
   - the total amount of funding available for this service in FY81;
   - the total amount available in FY82; and
   - the funding you anticipate for FY83.

3. Which funding sources has your city tapped to compensate for federal budget cuts?

4. What kinds of emergency service needs has your city been asked to meet during the last year?

   What percentage of the demand for emergency services has your city been able to meet?

   What has been the effect on your city budget of providing emergency services?

5. What effect has the consolidation of federal programs into state block grants had on human service programs in your city?

   Under the health and human service block grants, have officials in your city been fairly represented in the state planning and resource allocation process; are funds being passed through in an adequate manner to your city government?

6. Describe a situation affecting a person or a family which best characterizes the impact that the recession/unemployment/budget cut problem has created in your city.

The responses of the 55 cities to these questions are described in this report. The appendix to this document lists the 55 cities which responded to the survey.

Note: Most cities do not have statutory responsibility for the provision of human services to their citizens. Often this responsibility rests with the county or the state government. Many cities, however, have taken on some responsibility for planning, coordinating, and/or administering human services programs for their citizens because local needs would not otherwise be met.

Local human service systems vary greatly from community to community, and so service information available to city human services officials is not uniform. These officials are sensitive to their communities' needs, but often do not have the facts and figures available to verify those needs. For this reason, not all of the officials contacted in this survey were able, within the time constraints given, to respond to all of the questions posed to them.

Service Areas Most Affected

Health, employment and training, and senior service programs head the list of human services programs identified by city human services officials as being most severly affected by federal budget cuts during FY82. The ten program categories most frequently cited by the officials were the following:

Program	Frequency
Health	22
Employment and Training	20
Senior Services	15
Energy Assistance	13
Child Day Care	13
Community Action	8
Weatherization	7
Para-Transit	6
Income Maintenance	6

An additional fourteen program areas, including youth, recreation, programs for disabled persons, legal services and refugee assistance, were also mentioned by human services officials as negatively affected by FY82 cuts.

Among the cities reporting that health programs were most severly affected were Atlantic City, Palo Alto and Pawtucket. Cities citing employment and training as most severly affected included Austin, Cambridge, Chicago, Houston, Dade County, Fort Worth, Gardena, San Diego, Seattle and Tulsa. Cities identifying services for elderly persons as most affected by budget cuts were Arvada, Baltimore, and Denver.

- Atlantic City's rodent control program lost all of its federal funding, but the city intends to continue the program.

- San Antonio is putting $2 million of city funds into energy assistance to compensate for the substantial cuts in federal funds which eliminated the program during FY82.

- Fort Worth's employment and training program went from $10.3 million to $3 million - a decrease of 71 percent. In Syracuse the program went from $5.3 million to $1.9 million - a 64 percent cut.

- Funding to provide social services, congregate meals and home-delivered meals to senior citizens in Baltimore went from $4.1 million in FY81 to $2.7 million in FY83 - a 34 percent cut.

- Denver's homemaker services program for the elderly has been completely eliminated.

The Gap in People Served

A number of cities were able to supply data on both the population served and the program funding for FY81, 82 and 83. Those cities indicated that not one program reached even 50 percent of the eligible population with human services in question during FY81 and FY82. And only one area, energy assistance, was projected to increase to meet 65 percent of need in FY83 (due primarily to one city, San Antonio, which will use $2 million in local funds that are projected to assist 32,000 people). The two programs reaching the smallest percentage of the eligible population were employment and training (reaching 9.7 percent in FY81 and declining to a projected 2.7 percent in FY83) and social services (serving 10.5 percent of the eligible population in FY81 and projected to decline to 7.6 percent in FY83). The table below summarizes the percentage of the eligible population in selected programs reached in FY81 and 82 and expected to be reached in FY83.

Percentage of Eligible Population Served By Program
(Data from Cities Reporting)

Program	Served FY81	Served FY82	Served FY83	Change FY81-83
Employment and Training	10	6	4	-60%
Senior Services	15	15	15	--
Child Day Care	19	16	14	-26%
Health	40	30	36	-10%
Energy Assistance	49	44	65	+33%

Funding Reductions

Reductions in the amount of funds available to operate programs ranged from a 56 percent cut in employment and training programs in FY82 (due in part to the elimination of the public service employment program) and a 42 percent cut in health programs, to a five percent cut in senior services and a three percent cut in para-transit. A 75 percent increase was registered in weatherization* programs, due entirely to a substantial increase in funding in one city, Rockville. (In addition, data on weatherization was available from only a few cities.)

Cities were asked to provide information on the total amount of funding available for a particular service. The figures reported may reflect, therefore, the addition of state and local funds provided to make up for decreases in

* Reported incorrectly as energy assistance in first printing of report.

federal funds. The table below shows the percentage change in funds available in FY82 and FY83, compared with FY81 levels, in selected programs.

Percentage Reduction From FY81 In Program Funds Available
(Data From Cities Reporting)

Program	FY82 Change	FY83 Change
Employment and Training	-56	-68
Senior Services	- 5	-11
Child Day Care	-14	-12
Health	-42	-52
Energy Assistance	-28	-26

COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL CUTS

Cities responding to the survey indicated that they were attempting to use other sources of funding to compensate for federal budget cuts. Twenty-nine of the 54 cities which answered this question (54 percent) indicated that they were using local general revenues to make up for federal budget cuts.

San Antonio was prominent among these, having added $2 million in local revenues to energy assistance programs for FY82. In child day care, San Antonio used local dollars to keep the funding level at $3 million from FY81 to FY83, with only a slight dip in FY82 to $2.7 million. The federal-city funding ratio changed dramatically between FY81 and 83. Federal funds accounted for 87 percent of the program support in FY81, with the remaining 13 percent coming from the city. In FY82, the federal government provided 66 percent of the funds; the city 34 percent. For FY83, the city is expected to provide 58 percent of the funds; the federal government only 42 percent.

Other cities indicating the use of local revenues to compensate for federal cuts in FY82 include Atlantic City, Arvada, Austin, Baltimore, Camden, Chicago, Dade County, Dallas, Evanston, Galesburg, Gary, Manchester, Medford, Melbourne, Paterson, Pittsfield, Rockville, Springfield, Syracuse, Trenton, and West Hartford.

Thirty-three cities, or 60%, reported an increase in private sector contributions in FY82. Included among these cities were Arvada, Austin, Baltimore, Brockton, Cambridge, Chicago, Dade County, Dallas, Evanston, Galesburg, Gary, Holyoke, Manchester, Medford, Pittsfield, Rockville, Seattle, Syracuse, Trenton, and Tulsa.

Only 12 cities, about one in four of those responding to the questions, indicated they had been able to tap other federal resources. Officials in Denver, for example, indicated that they were meeting some day care costs through AFDC work expense deductions, and that some of the elderly were getting homemaker services through medicaid.

Twenty cities reported using Community Development Block Grant funds to support human services programs.

EMERGENCY SERVICES

Poor economic conditions have increased the emergency needs of people across the country. According to city officials responding to this survey, the most basic human necessities -- shelter and food -- led the list of the emergency services most needed in cities. Forty-three cities (78 percent) identified shelter as among the services most in demand; forty cities (73 percent) identified food. Fuel assistance followed, with 30 cities (55 percent) identifying this need. Income assistance was reported by 21 cities (38 percent), and medical assistance was cited by 14 (25 percent). Other emergency services sought included transportation, detoxification, employment, weatherization, clothing, crime victims assistance, and day care.

For many cities, emergency services are provided by county governments or nonprofit organizations and churches, rather than by the city government. A number of cities indicated, however, that they were undertaking efforts to meet the increasing need for emergency services:

- Arvada has opened a food bank run by volunteers, and the city is using vacant city-owned housing to provide shelter for transients and people evicted from their homes. In addition, volunteers have cut firewood for distribution at the food bank.

- In one New England city, funds have been raised through the Mayor's office to provide food, heat, and shelter for needy families and individuals.

- Evanston, in conjunction with Evanston Township, is providing food, heat, and housing.

All city officials providing information on emergency services estimated that, on average, 43 percent of the emergency demand was being met in their communities.

Twenty cities estimated that they were able to meet less than half of the demand for emergency services in FY82; 15 said they met more than half the demand.

Cities estimating that they were able to meet a very small percentage (10 percent or less) of the emergency demands included Brockton, Dade County, Gary, Manchester, Memphis, and Scottsdale.

Cities which estimated that most emergency service needs had been met included Camden, Chicago, Madison, Paterson, and San Antonio.

Half of the city officials providing information on emergency services indicated that the provision of these services was having some adverse effect on their city budgets. Included here were Baltimore, Gary, Madison, Manchester, Pittsfield, and three others. Five cities (Atlantic City, Brockton, Trenton, University City, and one other), said it was having a serious adverse effect.

The remaining cities reported moderate adverse effects.

Officials in twenty-four cities, however, reported no effect of emergency services on their budgets due principally to the fact that agencies outside the city government provide emergency services in their communities.

BLOCK GRANT IMPLEMENTATION IN FY82

For most states FY82 was the first year of implementation of the state block grants which consolidated the administration of numerous categorical human services programs at the state level. According to information supplied by city human service officials responding to this survey, most city programs were negatively affected by the conversion to block grants. Most indicated that their cities had not been adequately involved in either the state block grant planning process or the state resource allocation process. They in-indicated, in addition, that state block grant funds had not been passed through to their cities in an adequate manner

Fully two-thirds of the cities reported that state block grants had some adverse effects on their human service programs. Adversely affected were cities such as Cambridge, Forth Worth, Gary and Houston. Cities reporting at least moderate adverse effects included Baltimore, Brockton, Denver, Holyoke, San Antonio, Trenton and Tulsa. Three cities, Chicago among them, reported that there had been a serious adverse effect on their programs.

Fourteen cities reported that conversion to state block grants had no effect at all on their local programs. Atlantic City, Evanston, Madison, Memphis, Seattle, Syracuse and West Hartford were among these.

Two cities, including the newly-established city of Santee which receives no federal funds for human services (but does receive Community Development Block Grant funds through HUD's Small Cities Program), reported the effect of conversion to state block grants had been positive.

In regard to the representation of cities in the planning associated with the state block grants, 70 percent of the local officials did not believe they had been fairly represented. Among the 14 cities where officials felt they had been represented were Baltimore, Dallas, Denver, Memphis, Pawtucket, Pittsfield and Trenton.

Seventy percent of the city officials responding to the survey said that they were not fairly represented in the state block grant resource allocation process. Here again, 14 cities, including those listed in the preceding paragraph, felt they had been fairly represented at the state level.

About three out of every four cities responding to this inquiry reported that block grant funds had not been passed through the state to their programs in an adequate manner. The 11 cities that felt that their block grant funding was adequately handled included Baltimore, Dade County, Dallas, Denver, Seattle, Trenton and West Hartford.

- Officials in Tulsa indicated that the state uses most of its block grants to fund state agencies.
- In Gary, officials say that Indiana is not passing any funds through to local governments.

- Cambridge officials said they have not been able to obtain any block grant funds through the state.

- In Texas the seven largest cities are trying to influence the state block grant process, but Houston, at least, doesn't expect any change in FY83.

- On the positive side, Evanston's human services administrator said that the mayor is on the Governor's block grant task force and that the city, consequently, is optimistic about its role in the process.

IMPACT OF PROBLEMS ON PEOPLE IN CITIES

Most of the city human services officials supplying information for this report described situations which, in their view, characterized the impact of the combined recession/unemployment/budget-cut problem on the people in their cities. As would be expected, the examples of problem impact varied considerably from one city to another, but a number of common threads ran through them.

In cities across the country there is emerging a group that may be termed the "new poor" -- people who are losing their jobs, exhausting their financial resources, exhausting their unemployment benefits, and losing their homes. These people are coming to human service agencies for the first time, and it is difficult for them to do so. Human service agencies in Evanston report that they have been dealing with serious problems of psychological distress, alcoholism, and even violent behavior among those unable to cope with having to seek help from local agencies. In Arvada, skilled workers are taking any menial jobs that they can find. Even so, large numbers of people are being evicted from their homes. In Gary, officials report that unemployed persons are unable to hang onto their homes in many cases because the unemployment benefits available through the State of Indiana are among the lowest in the nation (maximum $147/week for a family of four or more). Families in Trenton, where unemployment benefits are higher, are facing the same problem; however, officials from two Northeastern cities indicated that many individuals and families, because they cannot afford to do otherwise, now share their homes with others, thus living in overcrowded conditions.

There are also serious problems affecting the "working poor" -- those who are employed in jobs which do not pay enough for them to break the cycle of poverty. In one Northeastern city, minimum wage workers are facing new stricter eligibility requirements for day care services. Those who are forced to remove their children from day care and who are unable to find an affordable alternative are then faced with the prospect of having to give up their jobs. Officials in Seattle speak of the return of many of the working poor to welfare. They described a case of a mother who was in training and receiving day care services; when she lost the training she consequently lost the day care services as well, and presumably any hope of a job.

The lack of jobs and of adequate social services for the jobless is forcing families to break up. In Rockville, family separation has occurred because there is no housing available to out-of-work families with no income. Springfield officials report that unemployed men are abandoning their families so that the families can receive AFDC payments. They report that whole families are now living in rescue missions and that more children are being placed in foster care situations.

Energy problems affecting the unemployed and the poor were cited by cities in the North and Northeast. In Pittsfield, meeting the fuel and shelter assistance needs of unemployed families is placing the greatest burden on

human service agencies. In Madison, up to 80 percent of the income of poor families is going to meet energy costs. Officials in West Hartford, Camden, and Arvada are tapping private funds and church funds to try to meet the energy assistance needs there. And in Grand Rapids, the United Way, which faces declining contributions, has received 700 requests for energy assistance since July, with many more requests anticipated as winter approaches.

Cities in the Southwest and the West cited special problems that have been created by the influx of unemployed workers from other parts of the country. Lured by the prospect of work in Western cities perceived to be relatively prosperous, thousands of transient individuals and families have placed extraordinary burdens on the human service systems in these cities. Austin officials cope daily with transients living in cars, looking through garbage cans, hanging around in office buildings. In Denver, a young woman who had been sleeping under a bridge was found murdered. Officials there believe that if adequate shelter had been available, this murder would not have occurred. In Houston, transients are living in their cars on freeways and in the parks; vagrancy has increased.

Human services officials in Tulsa describe a "typical" case of a family of three which arrives in the city with $500 in cash and all of their possessions in their car. The husband and wife cannot find work; they cannot find housing. They approach human service agencies for shelter, employment, food and medical services -- primarily prenatal and pediatric care. The agencies meet these needs in some cases; too often, they say, they cannot respond. It is estimated that in Tulsa -- a city which one year ago boasted one of the lowest unemployment rates in the nation -- there may be up to 1,000 people living in cars, trailers and tents, in camping grounds or in the woods, in the warm months and the cold months. There are now between 200 and 300 people living under bridges in the city. There has been a significant increase in domestic violence and in cases of murder involving the transients. They present problems to the hospitals that they approach for medical help, and to the schools which, in order to meet residency requirements for enrollment of the children, are accepting any location (e.g. an abandoned barn) as the family's legal residence. Tulsa officials also describe an increase in suicide attempts among persons, once gainfully employed, who now face desperate financial situations.

On the other side of the coin is the problem of cities abandoned by the unemployed. In Galesburg, because of plant closings and the movement of jobless workers, there are approximately 900 vacant houses.

In cities across the country, human services officials can provide case studies that reflect the serious family and personal problems that have been created or exacerbated by current economic conditions. Baltimore officials describe a mother of four whose job under CETA was discontiued and who, while hospitalized for a six-week period, had to place her children in relatives' homes. Her vacant home was buglarized during this period, and because she was unable to file the necessary papers, her food stamp and AFDC benefits were stopped. With the utilities in her home cut off and facing eviction, she was referred to the mayor's office for special assistance.

In New York, a working mother with two children, paying $175 per month for day care, had her AFDC benefits reduced by 40 percent over a four month period. Total income -- salary and benefits -- for this family dropped to $473 per month. In Syracuse, officials describe a woman, the sole provider for seven children, whose secretarial job with the city government was lost to budget cuts and whose food stamp and day care benefits were lost to revisions in the federal restrictions covering these programs.

APPENDIX: 55 CITIES RESPONDING TO SURVEY

City	Population
Ann Arbor, Michigan	107,316
Atlantic City, New Jersey	40,199
Arvada, Colorado	84,576
Austin, Texas	345,496
Baltimore, Maryland	786,755
Bowie, Maryland	33,695
Bridgeport, Connecticut	142,546
Brockton, Massachusetts	95,172
Cambridge, Massachusetts	95,322
Camden, New Jersey	84,910
Chicago, Illinois	3,005,072
Dade County, Florida	1,625,979
Dallas, Texas	904,078
Denver, Colordao	491,396
Evanston, Illinois	73,706
Fort Worth, Texas	385,141
Fridley, Minnesota	30,228
Galesburg, Illinois	35,305
Gardena, California	45,165
Gary, Indiana	151,953
Grand Rapids, Michigan	181,843
Holyoke, Massachusetts	44,678
Houston, Texas	1,594,086
Lafayette, Louisiana	81,961
Madison, Wisconsin	170,616
Manchester, Connecticut	49,761
Medford, Massachusetts	58,076
Melbourne, Florida	46,536
Memphis, Tennessee	646,356
Middletown, Ohio	43,719
Minneapolis, Minnesota	370,951
New Orleans, Louisiana	557,482
New York, New York	7,071,030
Palo Alto, California	55,225
Paterson, New Jersey	137,970
Pawtucket, Rhode Island	71,204
Pittsfield, Massachusetts	51,974
Poughkeepsie, New York	29,757
Rialto, California	35,615
Rockville, Maryland	43,811
San Antonio, Texas	785,410
San Diego, California	875,504
Santee, California	45,000
Savannah, Georgia	141,634
Scottsdale, Arizona	88,364
Seattle, Washington	493,846
Springfield, Massachusetts	152,319
Syracuse, New York	170,105
Taunton, Massachusetts	45,001
Trenton, New Jersey	92,124
Tulsa, Oklahoma	360,919
University City, Missouri	42,738
Washington, D.C.	637,651
West Hartford, Connecticut	61,301
Wichita, Kansas	279,272